

## REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4. As a result, claims 1-4 and 7-8 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Butterworth et al. (US 2004/0133656 A1), hereinafter “Butterworth”, in view of Lewontin (US 2005/0071419 A1), Hickman (US 2005/0198188 A1), and Koeppel (US 2005/0015491 A1). Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman teach or suggest “determining the address of the web service is an old address by checking a list of outdated web services, wherein each web service in the list is associated with the old address and a new address” as claimed therein.

The Office admits that Butterworth and Lewontin fail to teach or suggest this feature. See Final Office Action, page 4. Applicants agree. However, in

support of the rejection, the Office points to the abstract and paragraph [0007] of Hickman to allegedly remedy this deficiency. See *Id.* In particular, the Office contends that Hickman teaches “identifying suitable web services from a list of web services. See *Id.* Applicants contend that a list of suitable web services, as taught by Hickman, fails to teach or suggest a list of outdated web services, as provided in claim 1. Applicants contend that the Office has failed to show how suitable web services are equivalent to outdated web services. Additionally, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the list of suitable web services of Hickman teaches the list of outdated web services of claim 1, Applicants contend that the list of suitable web services of Hickman fails to teach or suggest “wherein each web service in the list is associated with the old address and a new address.” See claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants contend that Hickman fails to teach or suggest this feature of of claim 1.

Further, Applicants contend that Koeppel fails to remedy this deficiency of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman.

Applicants also assert that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman, and Koeppel fails to teach or suggest “forwarding a second request from the client server to the new address of the requested web service.” See claim 1.

In support of the rejection, the Office asserts that paragraphs [0058] and [0063] of Butterworth allegedly teach or suggest this feature. See Final Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As admitted by the Office, Butterworth teaches “redirect[ing] the request to an alternate web service instead of contacting the targeted web service.” See paragraph [0058]. In other words, Butterworth teaches a redirect to a different web service. However, claim 1 provides that a second request is forwarded to the new address **of the requested web service**. See claim 1. Emphasis added. Therefore, the second request of claim 1 is not redirected to a back-up or alternate web service, as provided in Butterworth.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 7, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman, and Koeppel.

With respect to claim 4, Applicants submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman, and Koeppel teaches or suggests a system for redirecting a request for a web service in a data transmission network that includes all the features claimed therein. For example, for reasons that should be clear from the discussion of the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman, and Koeppel above, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman, and Koeppel fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 4, including “wherein each web service in the list is associated with an old point address and the new point address; [and] ... regenerat[ing] the same request and ... forward[ing] the request over the data transmission network to said new point address” as claimed therein. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the

rejections of claim 4 and claim 8, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, Hickman, and Koeppel.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Elaine Chi Berlin/

Elaine Chi Berlin  
Reg. No. 61,194

Dated: June 1, 2011

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile